

1981

Student personnel services and some faculty attitudes, University of Northern Iowa, summer 1980

David Anthony Carbone
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1981 David A. Carbone

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Carbone, David Anthony, "Student personnel services and some faculty attitudes, University of Northern Iowa, summer 1980" (1981). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2139.
<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2139>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Student personnel services and some faculty attitudes, University of Northern Iowa, summer 1980

Abstract

This researcher intends to examine what services university faculty include under the auspices of student personnel services and the attitudes of university faculty toward each of those services they name at a particular state university in Iowa, i.e. the University of Northern Iowa.

STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES AND SOME FACULTY
ATTITUDES, UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN
IOWA, SUMMER 1980

A Research Paper
Presented to
the Department of School Administration
and Personnel Services
University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Education

by
David Anthony Carbone
January 1981

This Research Paper by: David A. Carbone

Entitled: College Student Personnel Services and Some
Faculty Attitudes, University of Northern
Iowa, Summer 1980

has been approved as meeting the research paper require-
ment for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education

J. F. Kimball

1/30/81
Date Approved

Director of Research Paper

Robert L. Frank

1/30/81
Date Received

Graduate Faculty Adviser

Donald L. Hanson

2/3/81
Date Received

Head, Department of School
Administration and Personnel
Services

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.	iii
Chapter	
1. THE INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem.	4
Importance of the Problem.	5
Assumptions.	7
Limitations.	7
Definition of Terms.	8
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
3. DESIGN OF THE STUDY AND ANALYSIS	37
Design of the Study.	37
Analysis of the Data	37
4. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	56
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	64
APPENDICES.	68
A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT.	70
B. COVER LETTER	73
C. FOLLOW-UP LETTER	74

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Level of Professorial Rank.	39
2. Number of Years of Service at UNI	40
3. Total Number of Staff Members Faculty Believe Comprise UNI Student Services.	41
4. Services Faculty Believe Comprise Student Services at UNI	42
5. Number of Faculty Who Have Made A Student Referral to the Listed Student Services	43
6. Student Services Faculty Believe Students Most Frequently Utilize.	44
7. Number of Faculty Correctly Naming the Directors of Student Services	46
8. Number of Faculty Suggesting Not to Cutback and to Cutback Student Services.	48
9. Student Services With the Least Number of Faculty Suggesting to Cutback or Not to Cutback	49
10. Average Faculty Rankings of Student Services' Contribution to a UNI Student's Intellectual and Social- emotional Development	51
11. Five Most Student Utilized Services With Faculty Suggesting to Cutback or Not to Cutback	52
12. Comparison of Item 7 Highest and Lowest Services by Receiving a Check From Faculty With Items 9 & 10	53
13. Comparison of Item 8 Highest and Lowest Services by Receiving a Check From Faculty With Items 9 & 10	54

Chapter 1

THE INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM

One of the most important missions of education is to influence the development of student's attitudes, values, intellectual, and moral commitments. To fulfill this mission an institution must act on the knowledge that each student has many developmental needs which must be met in a variety of ways, both formal and informal. The college does not prescribe how the student shall develop, rather, it provides resources and opportunities to facilitate student development. (Prince and Miller, 1977)

These resources may include classroom and lab instruction, informal discussions with faculty, or student activity programs, i.e. cultural, recreational, social, or educational workshops which focus on particular concerns such as human sexuality, assertiveness training, time management skills, and study skills, etc. Each of these resources are concerned with student development whether they are coordinated by faculty, student personnel staff, or students themselves.

Students should be challenged by the collegiate experience to strive for an enlightened understanding of their values and therefore to achieve more mature and thoughtful commitment to values, intellectual habits, and "deeper aesthetic joys, affect development, and enlightenment of the cosmos during their college years." (Williamson and Biggs,

1975)

Yet, the full potential of students cannot be developed until the emotional and physical aspects of their growth are given as much attention as the cognitive. "Out of the classroom" educational experiences not only promote nonintellectual development but act as a catalyst for integrating the intellectual, social-emotional, and psychomotor objective of postsecondary education. (Prince and Miller, 1977)

These "out of the classroom" educational experiences have usually been implemented only in separate and supplementary programs known as "student services". Wrenn (1951) states that "Student Personnel Services and instructional services together form the educational program of the institution. Thus the development of the student is the task of the whole college."

There has been much confusion, however, concerning the purposes of student personnel services and what those purposes are supposed to achieve. The term student personnel work came into use after World War I (Yoakum, 1919) when army psychologists returned to industry and the college campus with techniques and concepts to match men with jobs. (Williamson and Biggs, 1975) This led to the phrase "the worker in his work unit" (Hoppock job satisfaction) which later dominated vocational guidance with on the job training and expanded to the concept of career development on college campuses.

In postsecondary institutions developmental services such as residence living, "student activities", career placement, discipline, health, registration and records, and research on student life were all included under student personnel work.

Later on, additional services, such as, admissions, testing services, food services, student unions, foreign student advising, inter-collegiate athletics, and special clinics, i.e. reading, writing, studying, and time management skills had been subsumed sometimes under student personnel services.

With this large number of services, it becomes problematic that student personnel services lacks a coherent and functionable structure. Because some of these services tend to be generalist in function, the status of student personnel services as perceived by faculty is confused at best and insignificant at worst. This diversity of tasks performed by student personnel workers results in general uncertainty as to whether they are representatives of the students, allies of the faculty, or members of the administration. (Penny, 1969) Student personnel workers are, from one service to another and within some services, all three.

Some services can be perceived as generalist, specialist, or both. A definitive assessment, then, of these services by faculty becomes impossible. It becomes necessary to analyze faculty attitudes per student service or

reduce and/or categorize student services as those that are student development oriented and those which are generalist.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This researcher intends to examine what services university faculty include under the auspices of student personnel services and the attitudes of university faculty toward each of those services they name at a particular state university in Iowa, i.e. the University of Northern Iowa.

Those attitudes to be examined include:

- 1) What is the total number of staff members faculty believe comprise student personnel services at UNI?
- 2) Which services do faculty consider a part of student personnel services at UNI?
- 3) Which services have faculty referred students to at UNI?
- 4) Which services do faculty feel are most frequently utilized by UNI students?
- 5) Can faculty name any student service directors?
- 6) If cutbacks were necessary, what services would faculty suggest not be cutback?
- 7) If cutbacks were necessary, what services would faculty suggest be cutback?
- 8) What is the faculty's perception of the capa-

bility of student services in facilitating a student's intellectual development?

- 9) What is the faculty's perception of the capability of student services in facilitating a student's social-emotional development?

It is hypothesized faculty will not know the correct number of staff members comprising student personnel services at UNI, they will not check all those student services listed within the definition of terms in this research paper, they will not refer students to many student services, will not be able to name most directors of student services at UNI, and will find student personnel services incapable of facilitating a UNI student's intellectual or social-emotional development.

IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM

There are those who feel that although student personnel services are an integral part of the educational process, they are the most expendable within a college or university. (Humphries, 1977) Drastic fiscal pressures threaten to reduce the quantity and quality of student personnel services. In a period of budget restraints student personnel services are continually being assessed by administrators, long range planning committees who make priority decisions, and boards of trustees who decide on the amount of financial support to be granted these services.

(Astmann, 1975)

Faculty, additionally, who strive for increased decision making power through membership on boards of trustees, now possess a high degree of influence through faculty governance structures. (Astmann, 1975) How faculty perceive student personnel services and its staff assumes increasing significance for this field. (Astmann, 1975)

It has been suggested student personnel programs must support the academic program, meet student needs, and contribute to the college's overall development. These suggestions must be enacted in order to improve the image of student personnel services and be reiterated to boards of trustee members, administrators, and faculty. (Raines, 1966)

The results of this study will enable this researcher, as a future student personnel worker, to understand the status ascribed to student services within the academic community. More importantly, it will provide an institution with data as to the perceptions faculty possess of student personnel services, its necessity and importance, and thereby help the institution make decisions on: a) how to improve the image of student personnel services, b) increase faculty uses of student personnel services, and c) increase faculty awareness of its functions and what it can achieve.

ASSUMPTIONS

The purpose of higher education is to help fulfill all developmental needs of students.

These needs can be fulfilled through formal classroom experiences as well as "out of the classroom" experiences.

Student personnel services are a major force in attaining the mission of higher education which is to facilitate a student's intellectual and social-emotional development.

There exists some confusion amongst faculty personnel as to the function and structure of student personnel services, what services are included within this field, and the overall purposes and capabilities of this field.

A descriptive survey is the best method for obtaining the necessary information.

LIMITATIONS

A major limitation of this research is its external validity. Because only one university faculty is surveyed, generalizing these results would be speculative.

This research does not attempt to evaluate faculty attitudes but rather assess them.

The validity and reliability of the instrument being employed is very limited because it is self-made and has not been tested.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Faculty - shall include all instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors employed by the University of Northern Iowa during the summer of 1980.

Student Personnel Services - those services included are: Co-Operative Education, Foreign Student Advising, Orientation, Testing Services, Housing, Health Services, Registrar, Admissions, Financial Aids, Academic Advising, Dining Services, Counseling, Placement, Career Services, Student Activities, and Maucker Union. These are student personnel services listed on the university's Administrative Organization Chart, Fall 1979. In addition, Learning Skills Center has been included under Student Services at UNI.

Attitude - for the purposes of this study, those predispositions toward student personnel services which are indicated by the faculty checking off the attitudes survey instrument being employed in this study.

Intellectual Development - for the purposes of this study, facilitating knowledge through formal learning experiences.

Social-Emotional Development - for the purposes of this study, development of one's moral convictions and interpersonal relationships through formal and informal learning experiences.

Formal Learning Experiences - that which occurs in a class-

room or laboratory.

Informal Learning Experiences - that which occurs outside the classroom but which is structured so to facilitate intellectual and/or social-emotional development.

"Out of the Classroom Experiences" - same as Informal Learning Experience.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In undertaking a review of related literature very few studies were found on this problem. A possible reason for this absence is that the field of student personnel services has, only within the last 30 years, required their staff to possess a Master of Arts Degree in Education. It has been during this time the field has strived to gain recognition from faculty. Faculty, meanwhile, have only recently emerged as a powerful force in university governance thereby recently increasing the significance of having their support and respect.

James Selgas and Clyde Blocker conducted an evaluation survey from March 1972 through June 1972 concerning the importance, quality, and use of various student services functions at Harrisburg Area Community College. Faculty, administrators, student service staff, and four student groups (current, graduate, nonreturning, and student counselors) comprised the survey population. Of the 1,088 people who received the survey instrument, 553 or 51% responded.

Section A of the instrument referred to services such as Admissions, Registration and Records, Guidance and Counseling, Job Placement, Financial Assistance, Student Activities, and Administrative Services. Section B included, Psychological Services, Student Counselors, Advisor

Roles, the structure of student services, administrative functions as related to student personnel services, and attitudes toward the counseling process.

Alfred Wisgoski completed an attitudinal survey of community college presidents, chief student personnel officers, and faculty toward the guidance orientation of student personnel services and analyzed fifteen characteristics of instructors that affected their attitudes in selected Illinois Community Junior Colleges, 1967-68.

A two part checklist consisting of thirty items each was constructed. Part one focused on colleague evaluation while Part two was concerned with self evaluation. The survey was sent to selected Illinois Junior Colleges.

Replies from twenty-six presidents, twenty-six student personnel officers, and eleven-hundred and forty-three (1,143) instructors were compared by: a) instructor response to parts one and two, and b) by the responses of the presidents and personnel officers.

The conclusions reached included: 1) although instructors should be student oriented they are not, and 2) certain characteristics of the instructors training and experience distinguished guidance oriented from non-guidance oriented. It was recommended that instructors complete at least two courses in guidance, two in junior college concerns, and that they receive intensive in-service training.

Stephen Astmann has done a study of faculty percep-

tions of student services (1975). He found the perception as a large complex of operations with a vague, ill defined purpose. Being classified as only remotely necessary for the realization of institutional goals it is largely impractical in budgetary terms. Yet student services were also viewed as being somehow important to the educational mission of the university. This tends to confirm the confusion of faculty regarding the purposes of student personnel services. Faculty, furthermore, in Astmann's study, did not consider the mission of student personnel services as equal to academics and instruction.

Those respondents who did express positive attitudes toward student personnel services did not maintain this attitude when the question of budgetary allocations arose. None of the respondents felt more money should be allocated to student personnel services, although many felt that some areas such as, counseling, placement, and activities, should be upgraded at the expense of other services. Sixty percent of the respondents felt that some funds should be shifted from student personnel areas into areas of benefit to the faculty.

Student oriented services, such as, counseling and placement, received consistently high praise for their achievements, and most respondents suggested these services be augmented. Administrative services, such as, health services, financial aids, housing, student union operations, student activities, freshman and foreign student advising,

and the offices of Deans or Vice-Presidents for Student Affairs were considered important but not at the expense of counseling and placement services.

The distinction between administrative and student oriented services can be made only with "careful and precise discrimination because the degree of overlapping and blurring is obviously substantial." (Astmann, 1975) Faculty expressed disfavor toward offices alluding to serve student academic and personal needs, but which in reality "served primarily "paper pushing" functions involving making roommate assignments, coordinating calendars and room reservations, seeing that sundry forms are executed properly, assigning keys, carrying on appropriate correspondence, designing and facilitating budgets, hiring personnel, and providing liaison with upper administrative levels. While important, these functions were perceived as being ones which did not require either exceptionally well qualified personnel or major financial commitments." (Astmann, 1975)

Student personnel services have been viewed as being peripheral to the needs of students and the goals of higher education. (McConnell, 1970) There has also existed a definitive belief, however, student personnel services are necessary to attain the purposes of higher education. This includes helping students improve their social and personal relationships, participate in community services, and partake of those responsibilities and rights afforded American citizenship. (Morgan, 1968)

The Carnegie Commission has stated the main purposes of higher education (1973):

1. The provision of opportunities for the intellectual, aesthetic, ethical, and skill development of individual students, and the provisions of campus environments which can constructively assist students in their more general developmental growth.
2. The advancement of human capability in society at large.
3. The enlargement of educational justice for the postsecondary age group.
4. The transmission and advancement of learning and wisdom.
5. The critical evaluation of society through individual thought and persuasion for the sake of society's self-renewal.

Student personnel administrators are committed to providing a campus environment which constructively assists students in their developmental growth. Participation in campus life provides a balance in the daily routine of students and can encourage civic consciousness. A post-college life of service and community leadership can be a natural result of effective student personnel programs and activities.

Intellectualism does not begin and end in the classroom. "Out of the class" programs can stimulate independent effort and result in an appreciation of interdependence. Student personnel administrators are committed to the aesthetic development of students. "This implies a responsibility to promote responsiveness to art and nature, signi-

fying the integration of ideals, values, and morality." (Teeter, 1975) Student personnel is also committed to providing programs conducive to developing social responsibility.

Because a trend in higher education is toward increased academic flexibility while there exists recognition that intellectual and social-emotional development can occur in nonacademic contexts, student personnel services can be seen as a component of a college's mission: the enrichment of educational opportunities, the enhancement of the learning atmosphere, and the total learning and development of students. (McIntyre, 1972)

But to be accepted as integral to this mission and equal with the faculty, student personnel services need identify their activities with the intellectual and academic life of the college. Achieving a closer relationship with the faculty through teaching and performing research will help student personnel services attain acceptance of their importance and equality. (McConnell, 1970 and Jones, 1978)

Also seen as essential is a continuous evaluation of student personnel services. Evaluation in student affairs, however, is apt to be inadequate due to a lack of knowledge of student personnel services by faculty, administrators, and students. These people, nevertheless, need be involved in defining problems, collecting data, and interpreting findings. (Torrance, 1976)

Student services, despite minor gains, have still been perceived as ancillary services and programs designed to support the academic program, which is comprised of formal instruction and research, the mainstream of university life. Thus, the tendency for student personnel services to be organized and operated as a system separate from instruction symbolizes their ancillary purposes and status.

Because student personnel lacks a defined body of knowledge, skills, and ethics of professional practice, some faculty cannot view it as a profession. (Koile, 1966) Goals and functions tend to be defined by each institution rather than by a professional association. It has no clear status or reward system and its functions are not clearly defined. Student personnel services, then, tend to have little acceptance by students, faculty, or administrators. (Dewey, 1972)

Faculty, furthermore, often feel alienated from programs and activities sponsored by student services. (Adair, 1977) In an interview by a faculty member with an Associate Dean of Counseling and Testing an exaggerated amount of concern was focused on confidentiality of faculty in-class performance as perceived by students. Ten questions focused on this concern out of a total of thirty-seven. It may have been more than ten but on asking, "What are some of the chief problems expressed by students that are directly related to the faculty member?", the Associate

Dean responded by referring to a study soliciting student concerns during their collegiate experience. The uppermost concerned was fear of failure, this response then directed the interviewer's attention toward effects of stress on students and how faculty can help students cope.

Faculty, then, besides not having a clear perception of what student services are, also feel threatened by the functions of some services. Efforts must be made to develop models of student personnel and identify specific functions in which faculty and student personnel workers can engage. (Koile, 1966)

Brown (1972) has advocated a drastic reorganization of student personnel from service-centered to a developmental-focused organization. A principal objective of education is for more academic personnel to devote their research toward an understanding of student development (Parker, 1971). Student personnel services staff can earn acceptance within the academic community by sharing with faculty knowledge they possess of student development. Some relevant knowledge does exist which would facilitate the effectiveness of faculty-student relationships. (Williamson and Biggs, 1975)

Serving as a lifestyle of learning, education contributes significantly to the full development of student's potentialities. The American collegiate experience, moreover, strives to cultivate an informed citizenry, calling for the development of political sophistication. Student

personnel services has been conceived, then, as facilitating the development of students' full potentialities. Student personnel can help students effectively learn how to participate in managing the college as preparation for Jeffersonian citizens who will then manage America's complex society and correct "the degrading effects of poverty, racism, ignorance, and bigotry." (Williamson and Biggs, 1975)

Alternative value commitments should be presented as a means of challenging students to achieve more matured thoughtful commitments to values. (Sanford, 1966) A broad general education, additionally, can help students view their productive roles in perspective, develop values capable of withstanding organizational pressures, and live meaningful lives apart from their occupations. (Sanford, 1967)

Student development, then, is the development of the whole human being. More specifically, it is the application of human development concepts in facilitating the mastering of increasingly complex developmental tasks, achieving self-direction, and becoming interdependent. (Prince and Miller, 1977)

The American Council on Education (ACE) in 1938, expressed its "Student Personnel Point of View": 1) the individual student must be considered as a whole; 2) each student is a unique person and must be treated as such; 3) the total environment of the student is educational and

must be used to achieve his/her full development; 4) the major responsibility for a student's development rests with the student and the college together.

Prince and Miller (1977) have offered the following expansions of the American Council on Education's "Student Personal Point of View":

- human development is a continuous and cumulative process of physical, psychological, and social growth characterized by certain developmental tasks requiring an individual to alter his/her present behavior and master new learning.
- development is most likely to occur in an environment where change is anticipated.
- systematic integration of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor experiences produces the most effective development.
- abilities and skills facilitating growth can be learned, used, and taught by student development educators.
- an individual's development can be advanced by exposure to an organized problem solving process enabling one to complete increasingly complex developmental tasks.
- development is enhanced when students, faculty, and student affairs staff work collaboratively to promote the continuous development of all.

Chickering (1969) has offered seven major developmental vectors. One, achieving competence, involves the development of intellectual, social, physical, and manual skills. Competence is defined as the confidence one has to cope and achieve goals. Two, managing emotions, requires one to become aware of personal feelings, and recognize behavior resulting from those feelings. Three, becoming au-

tonomous, requires both emotional independence, i.e. freedom from continual and pressing needs for reassurance and approval, and instrumental independence, i.e. the ability to cope with problems without seeking help from others and the ability to be mobile in satisfying needs. Four, establishing identity, by maintaining continuity through an understanding of one's physical needs, characteristics, and personal appearance and sexual identity. Five, freeing interpersonal relationships, is achieved when an individual is capable of expressing greater trust, independence, and individuality in relationships by becoming less anxious and defensive and more friendly, spontaneous, warm, and respectful. Six, clarifying purposes, requires an individual to formulate plans and priorities integrating avocational and leisure time interests, vocational plans, and lifestyle considerations. Seven, developing integrity, involves making one's values both more personal and human.

A similar model Student Development Task Inventory, groups nine subtasks under three major tasks. (Prince, Miller, and Winston, 1974) To complete Task I, developing autonomy, one must develop emotional and instrumental autonomy, the capacity to live without constant reassurance and approval, independence from parents, coping with problems without help, mobility in needs and desires, and demonstrate capacity for self-sufficiency.

Task II, developing mature interpersonal relations, has as a major subtask developing tolerance. Another sub-

task is establishing friendships which survive difference and separation as well as an ability to project warmth, openness, and respect.

Developing purpose is Task III. One must develop mature plans for education, career, and lifestyle.

Implicit within these developmental models is the belief it is higher education's responsibility to offer students skills for producing growth within themselves and for creating knowledge.

In a supportive environment an individual should:

- "1) be free to risk disclosure of innermost thoughts and feelings without fear of attack or rejection; 2) be allowed to begin at his or her own level, move at his or her own pace, and master each succeeding level of learning before moving on through the developmental process; 3) have opportunities to identify emerging developmental needs and have an equal voice in deciding what learning to pursue and how to proceed; 4) be able to observe and interact with others who effectively model the characteristics, values, and processes which best represent the outcomes to which the environment is committed; 5) have access to the basic human, physical, monetary, and informational resources necessary for the development being undertaken; 6) receive accurate and usable cognitive and affective feedback and reinforcement in response to new ideas and actions; and 7) be encouraged to learn increasingly complex behavior and apply it, as appropriate, to his or her life situation."

(Prince and Miller, 1977)

Another aspect of student development, intentionality, has evolved from principles espoused by Ivey 1969, Ivey and Rollins 1972, and Ivey and Alschuler 1973. People who behave intentionally guide their own lives and function as self-directing/self-determining individuals. The intentional student development model has six components: goal setting, assessment, instruction, consultation, milieu management, and evaluation. (Prince and Miller, 1977)

Setting goals provides a map for development. Assessment provides needed information for achieving goals. Instruction, consultation, and milieu management are strategies for growth. Instruction includes formal and informal. Consultation guides and facilitates action by the student who controls his/her decisions and assumes responsibility for the consequences.

Milieu management is a collaborative effort to coordinate resources and design activities conducive to a particular developmental climate or physical environment. Evaluation refers to student development programs and staff while student success is measured as part of the assessment process.

This student development approach (Prince and Miller, 1978) offers many challenges to student affairs staff such as:

- to contribute to the knowledge of students in high-

er education by defining the types of growth that take place and the order in which they occur.

- to develop strategies for getting the goal of student development adopted as a primary aim of higher education.
- to find ways to contribute to the development of the total population on campus, not just to the remediation of a few.
- to develop collaborative programming with other student affairs departments and with academic departments.
- to identify, stimulate, and reward the participation of faculty members in nonacademic areas of college life.
- to understand human development and the student development model and fit that model to one's immediate situation.
- to provide the data and build the kinds of relationships that will motivate individuals, groups, and organizations to take responsibility for setting goals.
- to develop techniques for teaching self-assessment skills to individuals, groups, and organizations.
- to plan and present courses that promote both affective and cognitive development so that they will be incorporated in the curriculum.
- to introduce developmental goals into existing college courses.
- to develop ways of overcoming the forces that prevent student development educators from consulting effectively with the faculty or administration.
- to balance the ethical concerns that arise from trying to change people indirectly by altering the environment with the need to see that environmental characteristics support the development of human beings.
- to answer the question "To whom are we accountable?"

- to move from traditional models of student personnel work to the student development model without undue stress and anxiety.
- to find ways of communicating these new roles and the purposes of these new functions as student development educators to the rest of the campus-students, faculty members, and administrators.

These and other student development models make several assumptions: one, all humans strive to become free, liberated, and self-directed; two, the potential for development is possessed by everyone; and three, acceptance and understanding of persons as they are is essential to development. (Eddy, 1978)

Three resources utilized by student development to aid learning and growing are: consulting, administering, and instructing. (Eddy, 1978)

Consulting is working with students and other personnel to provide physical, social, financial, and intellectual resources for student development. The consultant helps an individual achieve self-growth by increasing personal initiative, involvement, and responsibility. A good example of consulting is the counseling center.

Administering is ideally accomplished by emphasizing coordination, communication, supportive services, and policies. Student personnel administration has been improved with the adoption of management-by-objectives (MBO) techniques.

Management-by-Objectives is "...a process whereby,

the superior and subordinate managers of an organization jointly identify its common goals, define each individual's areas or responsibility in terms of results expected...and use these measures as guides for operating ...and assessing the contribution of each of its members". (Odiorne, 1965)

A good management-by-objectives system would be accountable to: 1) student needs; 2) staff abilities; and 3) available institutional resources.

Instructing emphasizes knowledge and integration of experience. Knowledge can be obtained either inside or outside the classroom but is achieved by investigation, research, and experience. (Eddy, 1978)

How college student personnel programs are administered is determined by the variables which comprise a particular institution. Size of student population, type of institution, needs of students admitted, the institution's philosophy and traditions, geographic location, percentage of resident and commuter students, and support received from administrators, faculty, alumni, parents, and friends all determine how the college student personnel program at an institution functions. (Packwood, 1977)

Programs, then, from one college to the next are flexible, creating a student personnel field comprised of a multitude of viewpoints and practices. Most student personnel programs are an array of services administratively organized under a Vice-President for Student Services or

Student Affairs. There are nine basic services found within most student personnel programs. (Eddy, 1978) These include: admissions, orientation, housing, financial aids, student activities, health, counseling, placement, and student union.

Admissions has been a basic component of student services since the founding of Harvard College in 1636. Serving as the main linkage between college and society, admissions personnel communicate those benefits to be derived from higher education, i.e. an enlightened citizenry, a better understanding and appreciation of democracy, individual development, and increased earning power. This office serves as an internal liaison with faculty, students, and alumni and as an external liaison with prospective students, parents, and high school counselors. Recruitment, especially during times of student shortage, is an important aspect of admissions work. (Packwood, 1977)

Student financial aid has been traced to 1643 when Lady Ann Mowlson of London presented Harvard College with 100 pounds to be used for poor scholars. (Morrison, 1939) Since then funds to school poor students came from college's operating incomes until after the Civil War when state funds and private endowments became popular. Funds from major federal programs have only emerged within the past 15-25 years, i.e. Higher Education Amendment 1972; Economic Opportunity Act 1964; and the National Defense Education Act 1958. (Eddy, 1978)

Financial aids serves three groups: society, the institution, and the individual student. (Packwood, 1977) It provides: 1) the opportunity for a student to attend college; 2) enrollment for a college; and 3) educates a maximum number of citizens. Its purpose is to serve the needy. (Eddy, 1978)

Orientation began with the introduction of orientation courses first offered by Boston University in 1888. (Drake, 1966) By 1923 an orientation program at the University of Maine consisted of "Freshman Week" held prior to the fall semester. (Brubacher and Rudy, 1968) However presented, orientation proposes to instill within students the belief the collegiate experience is one of self-direction and intellectual stimulation. (Packwood, 1977) Orientation, then, while disseminating information about the college and helping the student adjust to college, should provide opportunities for students to do things for themselves. (Packwood, 1977)

Housing has been an enterprise of higher education since colonial days. Increases in student enrollments after World War I led to apartment style housing and larger housing units. These larger units became standardized in appearance by 1950-60, and were managed by professionals in an attempt to serve and control students. (Packwood, 1977)

As a means of behavior control, housing serves as an appropriate area where the college can act "in loco

parentis". More significantly, however, housing has become a focal point for student development. Today many housing programs are organized to support instructional and educational programs to further the intellectual development of students and provide an environment conducive to learning. (Clarq, 1970; Fairchild, 1961; Ferver, 1962) Residence halls also provide relaxation, recreation, and facilitate student social-emotional development. (Williamson, 1958)

Student activities during the colonial period reflected the religious fervor and religious orientation of colleges up until the Civil War. At that time, the influence of German thinking, imported by American professors trained abroad, held academic learning as the only responsibility and interest faculty should possess. This created a vacuum in student activities. (Stroup, 1964)

To fill this void student interest began focusing on athletics and fraternities. By World War I, efforts toward reintegrating the curriculum and extra-curriculum became a prime objective for educators. Student personnel, thereby, became the vanguard for conceiving the student as a total personality whose intellectual development is affected by personal development. (Stroup, 1964)

As a result, residence halls became living-learning centers, student-faculty committees were established, special interest groups formed, faculty became advisors to academic clubs, and activities directors taught self-manage-

ment and leadership skills. (Stroup, 1964)

Three factors are attributed to the rise of student activities. One, the decreased responsibility of the family for socializing its members; two, the advent of capitalism gave rise to increased specialization resulting in the creation of specialized body of personnel tending to students' noncurricular life; three, the emergence of a "Social Ethic", a belief in belongingness and emphasis on leisure time values. (Stroup, 1964)

These changes have allowed student activities to fulfill students' nonintellectual needs "based on both intellectual and socio-personal principles and with the belief that the curriculum and extracurriculum are parallel tracks of interest". (Packwood, 1977)

Student activities, then, are an integral part of college life and an essential aspect of the educational process. Stroup (1964) says:

....The student activities program secures its rationale only as it supports the chosen goals of the university in the details and general organization of its activities. Theoretically, there can never be a division between the student activities program and the rest of the university, between the curriculum and the noncurriculum.

Student activities, additionally, purport to cultivate good democratic values. Individual growth and social responsibility, then, are both goals to be achieved through participation in student activities. There exists a total of six functions of student activities: 1) aca-

ademic and intellectual, 2) social, 3) group, 4) student development, 5) leadership and democratic, 6) campus and community life. (Stroup, 1964)

Through planned activities and events, formal learning can be effectively applied in the immediate out-of-the-classroom experiences. Student activities, however, differ from in-class experiences because they are self-directed, rather than teacher-directed, thereby requiring student initiative, drive, and disciplined behavior.

Student activities, furthermore, promote social interaction and facilitate understanding of social relations, i.e. an understanding of the social and cultural forces that exert pressures on the attitudes, values, and actions, of individuals and groups. (Packwood, 1977)

There is also an opportunity for group interaction. Students learn to live in groups, organize groups, conduct meetings, become compatible with different people, exercise co-operation, exchange ideas, and gain a sense of responsibility within a group.

Through self-expression students develop personality, thus student activities facilitates self-discovery and self-actualization. Student activities also serve as a vehicle for the application of conceptualized values to specific situations. (Packwood, 1977)

Through involvement in student activities, students engage in democratic processes thereby assisting their

learning of qualities of good citizenship, the potential to develop leadership, and concern for the welfare of society. (Packwood, 1977)

Student activities, ultimately, helps unite the campus by encouraging interaction between and amongst students, faculty, and administrators. As the collegiate experience prepares students for effective participation in community living, student activities provides opportunities for such and recognizes the necessity of adapting to changing needs as the composition and characteristics of the community changes. (Packwood, 1977)

The college union first emerged at Cambridge University in 1815 serving as a forum for debate. (Butts, 1965) Oxford University in 1857 erected the first union building, while for the United States, Houston Hall on the University of Pennsylvania campus in 1896 became the first American union building. (Stevens, 1969)

Union evolution has been characterized by a number of stages from the Debate Stage (1815-1894) through the Humanization Stage (1967-present). (Humphreys, 1946; Stevens, 1969)

The "Statement of Purpose" adopted by the Association of College Unions-International at its 1956 Annual Conference reads:

1. The union is the community center of the college, for all members of the college family - students, faculty, administration, alumni and guests. It is not just a building; it is also an organization and a program. Together they represent a

well-considered plan for the community life of the college.

2. As the "Living room" or the "hearthstone" of the college, the union provides for the services, conveniences, and amenities the members of the college family need in their daily life on the campus and for getting to know and understand one another through informal association outside the classroom.
3. The union is part of the educational program of the college. As the center of college community life, it serves as a laboratory of citizenship, training students in social responsibility and for leadership in our democracy. Through its various boards, committees, and staff, it provides a cultural, social, and recreational program, aiming to make free time activity a cooperative factor with study in education. In all its processes it encourages self-directed activity, giving maximum opportunity for self-realization and for growth in individual social competency and group effectiveness. Its goal is the development of persons as well as intellects.
4. The union serves as a unifying force in the life of the college, cultivating enduring regard for and loyalty to the college.

These purposes and functions of the union originate in the belief colleges must provide a stimulating social environment as a stimulus to further student intellectual and personal development. A union, additionally, provides a variety of facilities and services in meeting the daily needs of students, i.e. snack-bar, reading room, student organization offices, bookstore, post office, television room, lounge, pub, music room, theater, game room, etc., extending to a total of 130 possible facilities and services. (Jenkins and McQueen, 1973)

The World Health Organization (1947) had defined

health "as a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease or infirmity". Good health, then, becomes as Maslow's self-actualization. Its importance is reflected in the number of colleges providing health services, however, not all colleges offer these services and no uniform health program exists between those schools providing this service. (Cooke, Huntington, and Knisely, 1969)

Complete health service programs include: health examination; care of minor illness and injury; bed care; medical advice on health problems not associated with illness, i.e. mental, marital, and sexual; medical and nursing care in dorms; public health protection; and sanitary inspection of the campus environment. (American College Health Association, 1969)

Counseling as an organized service did not appear on college campuses until after World War I, when diagnosis, testing techniques, and other psychological advancements had been developed and implemented. (Packwood, 1977)

A primary purpose for counseling is to serve as a campus agency for students and resource agency for faculty. (Wrenn, 1951) Counseling should focus attention on the adjustment of students to the campus and academic environment (Mueller, 1961) and be involved in the planning and implementation of the academic and administrative aspects of student life. (The University and College Counseling Center Task Force, 1970) A counseling center, then, must nec-

essarily be cognizant of changing student needs enabling it to help students receive the maximum benefits from their academic environment. (Kirk, 1971)

Oxford University established the earliest college placement service in 1899 (Wrenn, 1951), while Frank Parsons, a Boston educator and social worker, served as the catalyst for the vocational guidance movement. (Packwood, 1977) Yale, in 1919, opened the first United States placement service. (Teal and Herrick, 1962)

Most colleges, however, did not establish a placement service until after World War II when new technologies created new occupations causing business and industry to actively recruit employees. In 1957 the College Placement Council was organized to serve as a clearinghouse for placement publications and stimulate communications and research as well as coordinate placement associations. (Packwood, 1977)

The essence of career planning and placement is to achieve integration of self-understanding and knowledge of the work world (McDaniel, Lallas, Saum, and Gilmore, 1959) Counseling guidance, and advising have become key concerns of placement rather than merely matching students with jobs. Placement has become learning and preparing students vocationally and intellectually toward life long objectives. (Packwood, 1977)

Along with these nine services additional services are included under student services at some colleges. Four

general headings can be established as a means of categorizing this myriad number of services. (Knowles, 1970)

1. Welfare: Counseling (personal, vocational, educational, financial, religious, placement); Testing; Foreign students; Food services; Health services; Alumni services.
2. Control: Admissions; Recruitment; Record keeping (academic, nonacademic); Residence halls (resident, off-campus resident, married, commuters); Discipline.
3. Cocurricular: College unions; Athletics (intercollegiate, intramural); Social/Cultural activities, Student government.
4. Teaching: Foreign students; Remedial work; Orientation; Residence halls; Off-campus.

As seen from the research there has been a large amount of material written concerning student personnel services, its utility and potential on the college campus. This concern of student personnel services has been one since the twentieth-century, yet, no major research has been done assessing, analyzing, or evaluating attitudes toward student personnel services outside a few local studies (Astmann, 1975; Selgas, and Blocker 1972; and Wisgoski, 1967-68).

This becomes especially of concern during severe economic periods when budgets must be reduced. Without a complete understanding of the philosophy of student personnel services, programs can be easily dismantled as well as several staff positions. But the real victims are the millions of students attending colleges and universities.

If student personnel services possesses a sincere interest in facilitating student intellectual and social-emo-

tional development and structuring the campus environment to vacilitate learning, then, the field needs to better inform faculty, students, and administrators of its utility and potential.

Chapter 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY AND ANALYSIS

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

To answer the research questions and hypothesis an examination of faculty attitudes has been undertaken. These attitudes have been sampled from faculty employed at UNI by administering a structured questionnaire.

Because no instrument could be found in the literature, a new instrument has been devised and employed. This instrument consists of thirteen questions. The first three items are demographic. They solicit what department the faculty person is associated with, what level of professorial rank he/she holds, and how long he/she has been teaching at UNI.

Other items ask faculty to choose those services they feel are a part of student services. Additional questions are designed to generate the expression of attitudes and opinions concerning the composition of student services, how they are utilized, and what part they play in a college student's development

There are 266 faculty employed during the two summer sessions at UNI, excluding those faculty associated with the Price Lab School. This total was found in the 1980 summer schedule of classes and has been surveyed as a population in this study.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The instrument used is a structured questionnaire. Returned questionnaires will be analyzed as a group to receive an overview of all faculty sampled.

Conclusions will be drawn based on the answers faculty have provided on the questionnaire. These conclusions will concern the composition of Student Personnel as perceived by faculty, and their value in facilitating the intellectual and social-emotional development of UNI students.

A problem expected in this analysis will be the face validity of the instrument since it will be assessed by an inexperienced researcher. In terms of construct validity it will be interesting to see how this instrument will actually measure behavior which is determined by attitudes and values. Respondents have been asked to answer each question conscientiously and not merely check off responses for each item.

The major problem with analysis lies within the validity and reliability of the instrument. It is expected this research problem will generate much interest amongst faculty, thereby resulting in a high rate of return. The importance of validity and reliability becomes especially acute as more questionnaires are returned and statistically compiled and computed.

The results of this survey will hopefully provide insight into the perception faculty possess of student personnel services. This insight could thereby initiate

changes in how student personnel services are portrayed to the UNI academic and campus community.

It is assumed that both academic affairs and student affairs personnel will provide and share support and constructive criticism to one another in their common endeavor of enriching college student's intellectual and social-emotional development.

Of the 253 survey instruments distributed, 134 were returned for a response rate of 53%. The breakdown of professorial rank is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Level of Professorial Rank

Level	Number	Percentage*
Professor	40	30
Associate Professor	48	36
Assistant Professor	37	28
Instructor	8	6
No Response	1	-

*Percentages are based on number responding.

The level of professorial rank is almost evenly distributed between the first three levels, while few responses were received from instructors.

Responses for the number of years of service at the University of Northern Iowa are evenly distributed

for the first three groupings, as seen in Table 2.

Table 2
Number of Years of Service at UNI

Years	Number of faculty	Percentage*
Less than 2	16	12
2 - 4	13	10
4 - 6	12	9
Over 6	92	69
No Response	1	-

*Percentages are based on number responding.

While the first three groupings are evenly distributed, 69% of the responses are from faculty with over six years of service at UNI.

A good cross section of professorial rank has been received while most of the professors responding are those with over six years of UNI experience.

Because of this demographic portrayal, a knowledgeable response to Items 1, 2, 5, and 6 could be expected while a definitive assessment of the value faculty attribute to student services can be gained from Items 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10. (See questionnaire in appendix.)

Response to Item 1, the total number of staff members faculty believe comprise student services at UNI, is presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Total Number of Staff Members
Faculty Believe Comprise
UNI Student Services

Groupings	Number of faculty	Percentage*
Less than 10	6	5
10 - 20	21	18
21 - 30	18	15
31 - 40	5	4
41 - 50	10	8.5
51 - 60	8	7
Over 60	50	42.5
No Response	16	12

*Percentages based on number responding.

According to the office of the vice-president for student services, there are 58 FTE staff and 61 staff members total at the time the survey instrument was distributed. Those faculty checking 51 - 60 and over 60 comprised 50% of the responses. Thirty-three percent chose between 10 - 20 and 21 - 30.

This data suggests faculty are not very aware of the number of staff it requires for student services to function. While one might have argued perhaps faculty are not aware of the number of student services, Table 4 suggest they are aware.

Table 4
Services Faculty Believe Comprise
Student Services at UNI

Services	Number of faculty	Percentage
Counseling	130	97
Health Center	124	93
Career Planning & Placement	127	95
Admissions	68	51
Registrar	66	49
Foreign Student Adviser	109	81
Co-op Education	85	63
Students Activities	112	84
Maucker Union	101	75
Academic Advising	101	75
Housing	94	70
Financial Aids	106	79
Dining Services	82	61
Student Orientation	101	82
Testing Services	68	51
Learning Skills Center	<u>84</u>	78
Total	<u>1,587</u>	74%

As can be seen from Table 4, 1,587 checks were made by faculty out of a possible 2,144 totaling 74%. Counseling (97%), Career Planning & Placement (95%), and Health Center (93%), received the largest number of checks. Admissions and Testing Services (51%) each and Registrar

(49%), received the least number of checks. This data suggests faculty are fairly well informed of the services comprising student services.

Table 5
Number of Faculty Who Have Made a
Student Referral to the
Listed Student Services

Service	Number of faculty	Percentage
Counseling	87	65
Health Center	60	45
Career Planning & Placement	99	74
Admissions	48	36
Registrar	69	51
Foreign Student Adviser	37	28
Co-op Education	38	28
Student Activities	24	18
Maucker Union	25	19
Academic Advising	65	49
Housing	24	18
Financial Aids	80	60
Dining Services	11	8
Student Orientation	20	15
Testing Services	41	31
Learning Skills Center	79	59

Table 5 lists those services to which faculty have made student referrals. Four services; Career Plan-

ning & Placement (74%), Counseling (65%), Financial Aids (60%), and Learning Skills Center (59%), received the largest response as a service faculty who have made a student referral.

This data suggests the areas in which students with particular problems approach faculty for advice and help, or areas where faculty perceive a student as possibly having difficulty.

Table 6

Student Services Faculty Believe Students
Most Frequently Utilize

Service	Number of faculty	Percentage
Counseling	41	31
Health Center	83	62
Career Planning & Placement	72	54
Admissions	40	30
Registrar	71	53
Foreign Student Adviser	0	0
Co-op Education	1	.7
Student Activities	26	19
Maucker Union	70	52
Academic Advising	36	27
Housing	51	38
Financial Aids	67	50
Dining Services	65	49
Student Orientation	9	7
Testing Services	2	1
Learning Skills Center	10	7

Students utilize many student services, some more frequently than others. Item 4, presented in Table 6, solicited from faculty those services they believed students most frequently utilize.

Faculty were asked to choose five services they believe students utilize most frequently. Table 6 reflects a variety of responses with no one service receiving more than 62%.

Health Center (62%), Career Planning & Placement (54%), Registrar (53%), Maucker Union (52%), and Financial Aids (50%), received the largest percentages with Dining Services (49%) close behind.

In terms of the frequency a student uses a particular service, one could choose the above five as those he/she utilizes most frequently, with the exception perhaps of replacing Registrar with Housing.

Many students utilize the services of Career Planning & Placement, i.e. workshops, counseling, interviews, information, sending résumés, etc. Students use the Maucker Union daily, perhaps several times per day, i.e. attending programs, eating, shelter, information, etc.

Students receiving Financial Aids use these monies daily, besides seeking counseling, information, and completing forms. While Housing and Dining Services are not utilized by every student, those who do, use these services 24 hours and three times per day respectively.

This question can be misleading because every student uses Admissions, Registrar, Student Orientation (undergraduates), and the Health Center. The frequency these services are utilized, however, are only once during one's college career to 3 - 4 times per semester.

Table 7

Number of Faculty Correctly Naming the
Directors of Student Services

Service	Number of faculty	Percentage
Counseling	39	29
Health Center	35	26
Career Planning & Placement	75	56
Admissions	51	38
Registrar	66	49
Foreign Student Adviser	64	48
Co-op Education	29	22
Student Activities	4	3
Maucker Union	55	41
Academic Advising	69	51
Housing	43	32
Financial Aids	91	68
Dining Services	52	39
Student Orientation	32	24
Testing Services	16	12
Learning Skills Center	45	34

Items 5 and 6 of the survey instrument establish

a familiarity index. Item 5 asks faculty if they could name any directors of any student service. Eighty-one percent responded yes, 19% responded no, and one made no response. Item 6 requested the names of director's of student services. (See Table 7.)

As seen in Table 7, only three directors are known by a majority of the faculty, i.e. Financial Aids (68%), Career Planning & Placement (56%), and Academic Advising (51%) with Registrar (49%), and Foreign Student Adviser (48%) tallying close behind.

Asking faculty to choose four services they would suggest not be cutback (Item 7) and four services they would suggest be cutback (Item 8) if student services encountered cutbacks, presented them with a difficult decision. Table 8 presents the response to Items 7 and 8.

There is no service which faculty definitively suggested to cutback or not to cutback. Financial Aids (57%), Health Center (52%), Career Planning & Placement (47%), and Counseling (46%), received the largest number of faculty suggesting to not cutback these services. Co-op Education and Student Activities (46% each), Foreign Student Adviser (42%), Maucker Union (38%), and Student Orientation (36%), received the largest number of faculty suggesting to cutback these services.

Only two services, then, received more than 50% of the faculty suggesting to not cutback while no service received as much as 50% of the faculty suggesting to cutback

services.

Table 8
Number of Faculty Suggesting Not to
Cutback and to Cutback
Student Services

Service	%* Suggesting Not to cutback	%* Suggesting to cutback
Counseling	46	16
Health Center	52	11
Career Planning & Placement	47	6
Admissions	39	6
Registrar	42	4
Foreign Student Adviser	9	42
Co-op Education	9	46
Student Activities	10	46
Maucker Union	15	38
Academic Advising	35	12
Housing	21	14
Financial Aids	57	2
Dining Services	17	18
Student Orientation	8	36
Testing Services	5	24
Learning Skills Center	25	17
No Response (Actual #)	7	16

*Percentages based on number responding.

Although a definitive assessment cannot be made by analyzing Item 7 or 8 for the information requested, looking at these items for the opposite of what they are asking

does provide insight as to how faculty prioritize student services. (See Table 9.)

Table 9

Student Services with the Least Number of Faculty
Suggesting to Cutback or Not to Cutback

Service	% Not to Cutback (Item 7)	% to Cutback (Item 8)
Co-op Education	9	-
Foreign Student Adviser	9	-
Student Orientation	8	-
Testing Services	5	-
Career Planning & Placement	-	6
Admissions	-	6
Registrar	-	4
Financial Aids	-	2

In Item 7, for example, four services received less than 10% of the faculty suggesting to not cutback these services, i.e. Co-op Education and Foreign Student Adviser (9%), Student Orientation (8%), and Testing Services (5%). A fifth student service, Student Activities, received 10%.

Similarly, in Item 8, four services received less than 10% of the faculty suggesting to cutback these services, i.e. Career Planning & Placement and Admissions (6% each), Registrar (4%), and Financial Aids (2%), with Health Center receiving (11%).

It would appear, then, when looking for the least number of faculty supporting student services in either Item 7 or 8, a definitive assessment can be made as to the importance of these services as perceived by faculty.

The final two items of the instrument requested faculty to rank order the listed student services based on these service's contribution to a UNI student's intellectual development (Item 9) and social-emotional development (Item 10).

Table 10 presents the average rankings where one is the highest contribution and ten is the lowest, along with the number of rankings for each service and its standard deviation.

In response to Item 9, contribution to intellectual development, Learning Skills Center (2.94), Career Planning (3.94), Counseling (4.21), and Co-op Education (4.40), received the lowest average rankings (highest contribution).

Item 10, contribution to social-emotional development, four services received average rankings under 5.00, Counseling (2.89), Student Activities (3.22), Housing (4.34), and Maucker Union (4.38).

Student services received overall rankings suggesting their contribution to student development, as perceived by faculty, is moderate. The average ranking for all services listed in Item 9 is 4.93 with a standard deviation of 2.45, while for Item 10 an average of 4.84 and standard deviation of 2.72 do suggest, then, a moderate contribution by

Table 10

Average Faculty Rankings of Student Service's Contribution
to a UNI Student's Intellectual and
Social-Emotional Development
(1 = High, 10 = Low)

Service	Intellectual development	Social-Emotional development
Counseling	4.21 x= 104 S.D. = 2.59	2.89 x= 119 S.D. = 2.46
Health Center	6.25 x= 96 S.D. = 2.45	5.17 x= 107 S.D. = 2.61
Career Planning	3.94 x= 110 S.D. = 2.17	9.00 x= 1 -
Co-op Education	4.40 x= 102 S.D. = 2.45	6.75 x= 101 S.D. = 2.09
Student Activities	5.66 x= 100 S.D. = 2.46	3.22 x= 113 S.D. = 2.30
Housing	6.88 x= 96 S.D. = 2.46	4.34 x= 105 S.D. = 2.55
Student Orientation	5.63 x= 105 S.D. = 2.62	5.12 x= 110 S.D. = 2.38
Testing Services	5.16 x= 102 S.D. = 2.60	- -
Learning Skills Center	2.94 x= 115 S.D. = 2.33	9.00 x= 1 -
Foreign Student Adviser	- -	6.36 x= 109 S.D. = 2.46
Maucker Union	1.00 x= 2 -	4.38 x= 116 S.D. = 2.35
Dining Services	- -	5.82 x= 105 S.D. = 2.57
Other	3.33 x= 3	2.00 x= 2
No Response (Actual #)	15	11
Total	4.93 x= 935 S.D. = 2.73	4.84 x= 989 S.D. = 2.72

student services to a UNI student's intellectual and social-emotional development. The small standard deviations suggest a definitive assessment of these services by faculty in that the rankings were fairly uniform.

Comparing Item 4, to Items 7 and 8 (Table 11), will relate the student services faculty believe are most frequently utilized by students to the services they would or would not suggest be cutback.

Table 11
Five Most Student Utilized Services
with Faculty Suggestion to
Cutback or Not to Cutback

Service	% Suggesting to Not Cutback	% Suggesting to Cutback
Health Center	52	11
Career Planning & Placement	47	6
Registrar	42	6
Maucker Union	15	38
Financial Aids	57	2

Table 11 suggests those services faculty believe are most frequently utilized by students are the services faculty would suggest not be cutback, and similarly, not suggest be cutback, with the exception of the Maucker Union.

Table 12 presents a comparison of the services with the four highest and four lowest number of faculty suggesting

to not cutback these services (Item 7) with the contribution to the intellectual development (Item 9) and social-emotional development (Item 10) of UNI students.

Table 12

Comparison of Item 7 Highest and Lowest Services
by Receiving a Check From Faculty
With Items 9 & 10

Four Highest Services	Intellectual development (avg.)	Social-Emotional development (avg.)
Financial Aids	-	-
Health Center	6.25	5.17
Career Planning & Placement	3.94	-
Counseling	4.21	2.89
<u>Four Lowest Services</u>		
Testing Services	-	-
Student Orientation	5.63	5.12
Foreign Student Adviser	-	6.36
Co-op Education	4.40	6.75

For each service where a ranking is available, the services with the highest number of faculty suggesting to not cutback are those receiving the lower ranking (highest contribution). The weighted average ranking for these services is 4.59, while those services with the four lowest number of faculty suggesting to not cutback have a weighted average ranking of 5.66.

Table 13 presents the services with the five highest and four lowest number of faculty suggesting to cut-back these services in comparison to the average ranking these services received for contributing to a UNI student's intellectual and social-emotional development.

Table 13
Comparison of Item 8 Highest and Lowest Services
by Receiving a Check From Faculty
With Items 9 & 10

Five Highest Services	Intellectual development (avg.)	Social-Emotional development (avg.)
Co-op Education	4.40	6.75
Student Activities	5.66	3.22
Foreign Student Adviser	-	6.36
Maucker Union	-	4.38
Student Orientation	5.63	5.12
<u>Four Lowest Services</u>		
Financial Aids	-	-
Registrar	-	-
Admissions	-	-
Career Planning & Placement	3.94	-

Although the weighted average ranking for the four services with the lowest number of faculty suggesting cut-back is based on only one service, Career Planning & Placement (3.94), the weighted average ranking for the services

with the five highest number of faculty suggesting cut-back is (5.40). The average ranking for all services comprising Item 9 is (4.93) and for Item 10 is (4.84).

Chapter 4

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As can be seen from the data, four services, Financial Aids, Career Planning and Placement, Counseling and Learning Skills Center collectively and/or singularly received the most favorable responses throughout the survey instrument.

In Table 4 (page 42), for instance, "Services Faculty Believe Comprise Student Services at UNI", Counseling and Career Planning and Placement received the highest percentage of faculty recognition, 97% and 95% respectively, while Financial Aids received 79% and Learning Skills Center received 63% of faculty recognition.

In Table 5 (page 43) these four services received the largest number of faculty making a referral, i.e., Career Planning and Placement 74%, Counseling 65%, Financial Aids 60% and Learning Skills Center 59%.

In comparison with Table 6 (page 44), "Services Faculty Believe Students Most Frequently Utilize", these four services were ranked as follows: Career Planning and Placement, second; Financial Aids, fifth; Counseling, eighth; and Learning Skills Center, eleventh.

As to the number of faculty who could correctly identify directors of student services (Table 7, page 46), Financial Aids and Career Planning and Placement finished first and second respectively. Learning Skills Center

finished ninth and Counseling finished eleventh.

The number of faculty suggesting not to cutback these services is presented in Table 8, page 48. Financial Aids received the highest percentage while Career Planning and Placement finished third and Counseling fourth. Learning Skills Center finished a surprising eighth with only 17% of the faculty suggesting not to cutback this service.

For faculty perceptions of student services' contribution to student intellectual development (Table 10, page 51), Learning Skills Center, Career Planning and Placement and Counseling, respectively, received the highest three rankings.

Finally in Table 11 (page 52) Financial Aids and Career Planning and Placement were two services with the least number of faculty suggesting to cutback these services.

Thus in every applicable item these four services collectively and/or singularly faired extremely well.

It appears, then, Career Planning and Placement, Financial Aids, Counseling and Learning Skills Center, while being services most faculty have worked with, are also services most valued by faculty.

Similarly, there are four services which had the least number of faculty making a referral to them, i.e., Dining Services 11%, Student Orientation 20%, Student Activities 24% and Maucker Union 25%, and are also least

valued by faculty either collectively and/or singularly.

In Table 4, for instance, "Services Faculty Believe Comprise Student Services at UNI", there are sixteen services listed. Those four services received the following rankings for faculty's recognition of their being student services: Dining Services, thirteenth; Maucker Union, tenth; Student Orientation, fifth; and Student Activities, fourth.

In Table 5 (page 43) these four services received the least number of faculty making a referral. Of sixteen services Dining Services finished sixteenth; Student Orientation, fifteenth; Student Activities, fourteenth; and Maucker Union, thirteenth.

In comparison with Table 6 (page 44), "Services Faculty Believe Students Most Frequently Utilize", these four services were ranked as follows: Student Orientation, thirteenth; Student Activities, thirteenth; Dining Services, sixth; and Maucker Union, fourth.

Results of the number of faculty who could correctly identify directors of student services (Table 7, page 46), are as follows: Student Activities, sixteenth; Student Orientation, thirteenth; Dining Services, seventh; Maucker Union, sixth.

The number of faculty suggesting not to cutback these services resulted in the following rankings: Student Orientation, fifteenth; Student Activities, twelfth; Maucker Union, eleventh; and Dining Services, seventh. (See Table

8, page 48).

Also listed in Table 8 is the percentage of faculty to cutback services. Student Activities and Maucker Union received the largest number of faculty suggesting to cutback while Student Orientation finished fifth and Dining Services, tenth.

For faculty perception of student services' contribution to student intellectual development (Table 10, page 51), Student Orientation and Student Activities both finished eighth of nine services listed.

Also presented in Table 10 is faculty perceptions of student services' contribution to social-emotional development. The rankings are as follows: Dining Services, eighth; Student Orientation, sixth; Maucker Union, fifth; and Student Activities, second.

Three valid questions exist then: Do faculty value particular student services because they have worked with these services most frequently, in terms of making referrals? In contrast, do faculty assign less value to those services they work with less frequently? More importantly, if they did work more frequently with those less valued services, how would their attitudes change, if at all?

It should be noted in requesting faculty to make suggestions of which services to cutback and not cutback, this researcher's perspective is more philosophical than economics oriented. Thus when Student Activities and

Maucker Union receive two of the three highest percentages for services to be cutback, they would not result in substantial savings for UNI.

As stated in Chapter 3, moreover, insight as to what services faculty believe should be cutback or not be cutback, can be better construed in Table 9. A very small percentage of faculty suggested not to cutback Co-op Education 9%, Foreign Student Advisor 9%, Student Orientation 8% and Testing Services 5%. This appears to be a more definitive assessment than Item 8, what services would faculty suggest be cutback, because no one service received more than 56% of the faculty vote.

It would be interesting to investigate why these four services would not be chosen by more faculty as services which should not be cutback.

Foreign Student Advisor is a necessary position if a university is to enroll foreign students, while Co-op Education parallels Career Planning and Placement by preparing students for work. The only difference is that Co-op Education offers practical experience. Both these services lack size because they provide a service to a particular student group.

This may explain then why a small number of faculty suggested to not cutback these services. Only a small segment of the student body would be adversely affected if these services were to be cutback.

Career Planning and Placement 6%, Admissions 6%,

Registrar 4% and Financial Aids 2%, received the least number of faculty votes for cutting back. Admissions, Registrar and Financial Aids are basic and essential services for any college or university. Admissions recruits students, Financial Aids provides the financial means for students to attend college, while Registrar connects students with courses.

Career Planning and Placement could be replaced with other essential services, such as, Health Center or Housing. However, the need for students to identify and attain a satisfying career especially during a difficult economic period requires the acquisition of various skills, i.e., communication skills, job hunting skills and interpersonal skills, etc., all of which can be learned through Career Planning and Placement. This service can become a prime public relations area for a university to attract incoming students.

Faculty response to Items 9 and 10, contribution to intellectual and social-emotional development, were nearly equal. With 1 signifying high contribution and 10 signifying low contribution, faculty's ranking of student services' contribution to intellectual development was 4.93, while social-emotional development received 4.84. These moderate rankings suggest, that in the faculty's view, student services do make a contribution to a student's intellectual and social-emotional development, however, their contributions could be improved.

Better communication of the purposes and functions of student services might enlarge the faculty's perceptions of the contributions being made to students. Also, student services need to improve its connections with the educational mission of the university.

This can be readily seen in the Health Center, which faculty perceive as the most utilized student service and one of the services not suggested for cutback. However, according to this faculty survey, it does not contribute much to a student's intellectual or social-emotional development. With concepts such as Wellness, problems and concerns such as birth control, venereal disease, etc., it seems a health center can play a major role in facilitating and transmitting health education.

As has been stated in other related literature, a vast array of services comprise student services. This is true at UNI where sixteen services comprise student services.

According to this particular survey, faculty are fairly knowledgeable about the number of staff working in student services at UNI and are aware of which services comprise student services at UNI.

While no one service is recognized as a student service by less than 49% of the faculty, three services did receive less faculty recognition than others as being a student service. They are: Registrar 49%, Admissions 50% and Testing Services 51%. Dining Services received

61% faculty recognition while Co-op Education received 63%. The remaining twelve services received at least 70% faculty recognition.

Perhaps by placing services, such as, Admissions, Registrar, Testing Service and Learning Resource Center, under a more appropriate administrative or academic area, student services would enjoy greater recognition by faculty who would also more readily perceive student services' purpose and function.

My research is intended to stimulate and encourage greater interaction between student services and university faculty as a means of increasing each other's understanding of the purposes and functions of the other. In this endeavor, it is hoped misunderstandings, which can create suspicions and threatening feelings, can be mitigated.

Both student services and university faculty can improve their functions by working supportively and collectively in attaining the missions of their university. This will directly improve the university's operation and consequently benefit the local community, society and students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adair, Carolyn, "Faculty Attitudes Toward the College Union", NASPA, July 1977, pgs. 263-67.
- American College Health Association, "Recommended Strategies and Practices for a College Health Program", Jl. of the American College Health Association, 1969, 41, pgs. 41-75.
- Arbuckle, D.S., Student Personnel Services in Higher Education, New York: McGraw Hill, 1953, pgs. 16-38, 78-85.
- Astmann, Stephen, "Faculty Perceptions of Student Personnel Staff: Implications for Survival", National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors Journal, Winter 1975, pgs. 65-70.
- Blake, Elizabeth, "Classroom and Context: An Educational Dialectic," Academe, Bulletin of AAUP, v6#5, September 1979, pgs. 280-92.
- Blocker, Clyde, and James Selgas, "Student Services, An Evaluation over Time, 1972-76", Research Report #13, HACC Pa., Eric Document 148 048, 1977.
- Brown, Robert, D., "Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education - A Return to the Academy", ACPA, Student Personnel Series #16, Washington, D.C., 1972.
- Brubacker, John, S., and Willis Ruddy, Higher Education In Transition, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, pgs. 14-62.
- Chickering, A.W., Education and Identity, San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1969, pgs. 1-123.
- Clarq, J.R., "The Educational Impact of Resident Halls", Improving College and University Teaching, 1970, 18(1), pgs. 44-45.
- Cooke, J., and others, "Profile of Eighteen University Health Services", Jl. of the American College Health Association, 1969, 47, pgs. 85-94.
- Dewey, Mary, "Student Personnel Workers of 1980", National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, Winter 1972, pgs. 59-64.
- Drake, R.W., Freshman Orientation in the U.S. Colleges and Universities, Fort Collins: Colorado State University, Eric Document 030 923, 1966.

- Eddy, John, College Student Personnel Development, Administration, and Counseling, Washington: University Press of America, 1977, pgs. 1-88, 203-267.
- Fairchild, E., "Current Problems and Programs in Residence Halls", Jl. of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1961, 24, pgs. 144-49.
- Farnsworth, D.L., "College Health Services in the U.S.", Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1965, Student Personnel Monograph Series, #4.
- Ferber, D.A., "Academic Influences in Student Housing", Jl. College Student Personnel, 1962, 4, pgs. 2-10.
- Holland, E.E., and R.K. Kleinburg, "Student Affairs Personnel: Partners of Second Class Citizens?", Improving College and University Teaching, Spring 1974, pgs. 115-16.
- Humphries, Jack W., "Student Personnel Professionals: Is There a Future?", Educational Record, Winter 1977, pgs. 59-65.
- Jones, John D., "Student Personnel Work: Current State and Future Directions", NASPA, Spring 1978, pgs. 2-11.
- Kirk, Henry P., "Bringing Counseling and Placement Together", Jl. of College Placement, v3#4, April-May 1971, pgs. 44-49.
- Klotsche, Jim, and W.R. Butler, "Should Student Personnel Administrators Be Given Tenure?", Journal of College Student Personnel, July 1967, pgs. 225-30.
- Knowles, Asa, Handbook of College and University Administration, Academic, New York: McGraw Hill, 1970, pgs. 7-3 to 7-172.
- Koile, Earl, "Student Affairs, Forever the Bridesmaid". NASPA, October 1966, pgs. 65-72.
- McConnell, T.R., "Student Personnel Services-Central or Peripheral?", NASPA, July 1970, pgs. 55-63.
- McDaniel, Henry Bonner, and others, Readings in Guidance, New York: Holt, 1959, pgs. 330-36.
- McIntyre, James P., "Student Personnel Administrators: The Other Faculty, College Management, July 1972, pgs. 36-40.
- Morrison, John, The Founding of Harvard College, Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1953, pgs. 303-11.

- Morgan, David, "Student Personnel Services, Fringe Benefit or Integral Part of Education?", NASPA, April 1968, pgs. 111-16.
- Odiorne, George S., Management by Objectives, New York: Pittman Publishing Co., 1975, pgs. 11-56.
- Packwood, William T., College Student Personnel Services, Springfield, Il.: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1977, pgs. 3-200, 298-375.
- Parker, Garland G., The Enrollment Explosion, New York: School and Society Books, 1971, pgs. 26-75.
- Penny, James F., "Student Personnel Work: Role Conflict and Campus Power", Journal of Education, February 1969, pgs. 42-52.
- Prince, J.S., T.K. Miller, and R.B. Winston, "Student Development Task Inventory Guidelines", Athens, Ga.: Student Development Association, 1974.
- Prince, Judith S., and Theodore K. Miller, The Future of Student Affairs, San Francisco, Ca.: Jossey-Bass, 1977, pgs. 4-30.
- Raines, Max R., "The Student Personnel Situation", Junior College Journal, February 1966, pgs. 6-8.
- Russel, John H., "Some Points of Concern in Student Services Administration", Journal of College Student Personnel, July 1966, pgs. 241-45.
- Sanford, Nevitt, Self and Society, New York: Atherton Press, 1966, pgs. 46-59.
- _____, "Developmental Status of Entering Freshman, The American College", New York: John Wiley, 1967, Chapter 6.
- Stevens, G., "The College Union-Past, Present, and Future, NASPA, 1969, 7, pgs. 16-21.
- Stroup, H., Toward A Philosophy of Organized Student Activities, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1964, pgs. 16-75.
- Teeter, Ruskin, "What the Carnegie Commission Says to Student Personnel Administrators", National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors Journal, Winter 1975, pgs. 70-76.

Torrance, Doug, "The Role of Evaluation in Student Affairs",
MSU Orient, Fall/Winter 1976-77, pgs. 24-28.

Williamson, E.G., Student Personnel Work, New York: John
Wiley and Sons, 1975, pgs. 8-28.

_____, "Students Residences: Shelter or Education?",
Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 26, February
1958, pgs. 392-98.

Williamson, E.G. and Donald A. Bigg, Student Personnel
Work A Program of Developmental Relationships, New
York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975, pgs. 1-30.

Wisgoski, Alfred, "Attitudes of Community College Presi-
dents, College Student Personnel Officers, and Fac-
ulty Toward the Student Personnel Point of View in
Selected Community Junior Colleges, 1967-68",
Doctoral Dissertation.

Wrenn, C.G., Student Personnel Work in College, New York:
Ronald, 1951, pgs. 3-77, 203-320.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT _____

-70-

PROFESSORIAL RANK PROFESSOR _____ ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR _____

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR _____ INSTRUCTOR _____

YEARS AT UNI LESS THAN 2 YEARS _____ 2-4 YEARS _____

4-6 YEARS _____ OVER 6 YEARS _____

1) WHAT IS THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STAFF MEMBERS YOU BELIEVE COMPRISE STUDENT SERVICES STAFF AT UNI ?

LESS THAN 10 _____ 10-20 _____ 21-30 _____

31-40 _____ 41-50 _____ 51-60 _____ OVER 60 _____

2) CHECK THE SERVICES LISTED BELOW THAT YOU CONSIDER A PART OF STUDENT SERVICES AT UNI.

COUNSELING	_____	MAUCKER UNION	_____
HEALTH CENTER	_____	ACADEMIC ADVISING	_____
CAREER PLANNING/PLACEMENT	_____	HOUSING	_____
ADMISSIONS	_____	FINANCIAL AIDS	_____
REGISTRAR	_____	DINING SERVICES	_____
FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISOR	_____	STUDENT ORIENTATION	_____
CO-OP EDUCATION	_____	TESTING SERVICES	_____
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	_____	LEARNING SKILLS CENTER	_____

3) OF THOSE SERVICES YOU IDENTIFIED IN ITEM # 2, CHECK THOSE SERVICES THAT YOU HAVE REFERRED STUDENTS TO.

COUNSELING	_____	MAUCKER UNION	_____
HEALTH CENTER	_____	ADACEMIC ADVISING	_____
CAREER PLANNING/PLACEMENT	_____	HOUSING	_____
ADMISSIONS	_____	FINANCIAL AIDS	_____
REGISTRAR	_____	DINING SERVICES	_____
FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISOR	_____	STUDENT ORIENTATION	_____
CO-OP EDUCATION	_____	TESTING SERVICES	_____
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	_____	LEARNING SKILLS CENTER	_____

4) OF THE SERVICES LISTED BELOW CHECK THE FIVE YOU BELIEVE ARE UTILIZED MOST FREQUENTLY BY UNI STUDENTS.

COUNSELING	_____	MAUCKER UNION	_____
HEALTH CENTER	_____	ACADEMIC ADVISING	_____
CAREER PLANNING/PLACEMENT	_____	HOUSING	_____
ADMISSIONS	_____	FINANCIAL AIDS	_____
REGISTRAR	_____	DINING SERVICES	_____
FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISOR	_____	STUDENT ORIENTATION	_____
CO-OP EDUCATION	_____	TESTING SERVICES	_____
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	_____	LEARNING SKILLS CENTER	_____

5) CAN YOU NAME THE DIRECTORS OF ANY STUDENT SERVICES ? YES _____ NO _____ -71-

6) IF YOU ANSWERED YES TO ITEM # 5, IDENTIFY THE DIRECTORS YOU CAN NAME BY WRITING THEIR NAMES ALONGSIDE THE SERVICE(S) THEY DIRECT FOR THE SERVICES LISTED BELOW.

COUNSELING	_____	MAUCKER UNION	_____
HEALTH CENTER	_____	ACADEMIC ADVISING	_____
CAREER PLANNING/PLACEMENT	_____	HOUSING	_____
ADMISSIONS	_____	FINANCIAL AIDS	_____
REGISTRAR	_____	DINING SERVICES	_____
FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISOR	_____	STUDENT ORIENTATION	_____
CO-OP EDUCATION	_____	TESTING SERVICES	_____
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	_____	LEARNING SKILLS CENTER	_____

7) IF STUDENT SERVICES ENCOUNTERED CUTBACKS, WHICH SERVICES WOULD YOU SUGGEST NOT BE CUTBACK. (CHOOSE A MAXIMUM OF FOUR) .

COUNSELING	_____	MAUCKER UNION	_____
HEALTH CENTER	_____	ACADEMIC ADVISING	_____
CAREER PLANNING/PLACEMENT	_____	HOUSING	_____
ADMISSIONS	_____	FINANCIAL AIDS	_____
REGISTRAR	_____	DINING SERVICES	_____
FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISOR	_____	STUDENT ORIENTATION	_____
CO-OP EDUCATION	_____	TESTING SERVICES	_____
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	_____	LEARNING SKILLS CENTER	_____

8) IF STUDENT SERVICES ENCOUNTERED CUTBACKS, WHICH SERVICES WOULD YOU SUGGEST BE CUTBACK. (CHOOSE A MAXIMUM OF FOUR) .

COUNSELING	_____	MAUCKER UNION	_____
HEALTH CENTER	_____	ACADEMIC ADVISING	_____
CAREER PLANNING/PLACEMENT	_____	HOUSING	_____
ADMISSIONS	_____	FINANCIAL AIDS	_____
REGISTRAR	_____	DINING SERVICES	_____
FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISOR	_____	STUDENT ORIENTATION	_____
CO-OP EDUCATION	_____	TESTING SERVICES	_____
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	_____	LEARNING SKILLS CENTER	_____

9) RANK ORDER THE SERVICES BELOW YOU BELIEVE CONTRIBUTE TO THE INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF UNI STUDENTS. (1 = HIGHEST CONTRIBUTION ; 10 = LOWEST CONTRIBUTION) .

COUNSELING	_____	HOUSING	_____
HEALTH CENTER	_____	STUDENT ORIENTATION	_____
CAREER PLANNING	_____	TESTING SERVICES	_____
CO-OP EDUCATION	_____	LEARNING SKILLS CENTER	_____
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	_____	OTHER	_____

10) RANK ORDER THE SERVICES BELOW YOU BELIEVE CONTRIBUTE TO THE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF UNI STUDENTS. (1 = HIGHEST CONTRIBUTION ; 10 = LOWEST CONTRIBUTION) .

COUNSELING	_____	MAUCKER UNION	_____
HEALTH CENTER	_____	HOUSING	_____
FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISOR	_____	DINING SERVICES	_____
CO-OP EDUCATION	_____	STUDENT ORIENTATION	_____
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	_____	OTHER	_____

APPENDIX B

Dear Faculty Member,

I am a graduate student in the Department of School Administration and Personnel Services. My research paper is entitled "Faculty Attitudes Toward Student Services".

Could you please take a few minutes from your schedule to answer this questionnaire? Thank-you for your time and cooperation. When you answer the entire questionnaire please fold it so my name and address appear on the outside and drop it in campus mail by JULY 7th, 1980.

Student Services have been organized in the belief that individuals function as total personalities with intellectual competence, physical health, emotional maturity, and social adjustment all operating together in an inter-related fashion. These services strive to facilitate student development which can be viewed as a continuous and cumulative process of intellectual, physical, psychological, and social-emotional growth.

This is achieved through a variety of services. Some of these services had been traditionally performed by faculty. Today, because of increased professional specialization and student enrollments, a separate Student Personnel Services staff has been established in most institutions of higher education.

Student Services have been organized with four assumptions: one, the individual student must be considered as a "whole" person, this includes his/her intellectual, physical, and social-emotional make-up; two, each student is a unique person; three, the total environment of the student is educational and must be used to achieve his or her full development; four, the major responsibility for a student's intellectual, personal, and social development is a shared venture amongst faculty, student personnel staff, and students.

Student Services attempt to work with all facets of the academic community in establishing an environment for students conducive to academic learning. Ideally, then, Student Services staff collaborates with faculty, administrators, and students in assisting the college attain its mission, i.e. the total development of the student.

Sincerely,

David A. Carbone

APPENDIX C

JULY 14, 1980

DEAR FACULTY MEMBER,

APPROXIMATELY 1½ WEEKS AGO I SENT YOU A QUESTIONNAIRE "FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD STUDENT SERVICES AT UNI". IF YOU HAVEN'T ANSWERED THE QUESTIONNAIRE COULD YOU PLEASE TAKE A FEW MINUTES NOW TO DO SO? YOUR COOPERATION IS APPRECIATED.

FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE ANSWERED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, YOUR EFFORT IN DOING SO IS ACKNOWLEDGED AND APPRECIATED. I HOPE TO OBTAIN RESULTS BENEFICIAL TO UNI, FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS ALIKE, FROM YOUR RESPONSES.

IF YOU ARE CONCERNED WITH MY CODING ON AN INSIDE FLAP OF MY RETURN ENVELOPE, PLEASE BE ASSURED IT IS ONLY A BUILDING CODE, ENABLING ME TO DETERMINE WHICH BUILDING ON CAMPUS TO SEND A FOLLOW-UP LETTER.

SINCERELY YOURS,

DAVID A. CARBONE